

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Robert Gensemer](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
Subject: Weighting Matrix
Date: 05/05/2006 02:54 PM
Attachments: [PH_EcoFrameworkMatrix5_5_06.xls](#)

Matrix Notes:

I am sending along what I have been working on. I didn't have as much time to work on it today as I would have liked. However, I think it shows the basic framework that I hope can be a good springboard to "dive" into some issues related to immediate needs as well as long term ones, like risk evaluations for the Round 2 Comp Report and the risk characterization in the ultimate baseline assessment.

The first sheet shows the "key" for evaluating criteria. I am still putting some thought into this, and it is not exactly how I would like it, but it shows that we are going to have to pick and weight the criteria we want to use to evaluate the measurement endpoints (lines of evidence). Right now I have these as ??, because I didn't have time to start this part, and I think discussions will need to occur outside myself to make this appropriate. Not all criteria are created equal, and certainly not for the needs of this project.

Second, we need to develop criteria for weighting within each evaluation criteria. I have started this more for example purposes than anything. I think a scale of 1 to 5 is good, but if the LWG wants to go non-quantitative we can probably work with that as well. I would like to continue working on this, but if anyone has any thoughts send them along. I would like to show one or two examples for Tuesday.

We will need to tease out more chemical classes, where appropriate. I started on some measurement endpoints (e.g. surface water, TZ water), but didn't put different chemical classes in everywhere (this can be added later). There may also be some formatting / mistakes in the table - I need take some final runs through it.

Lets talk Monday morning if you guys are available - I would love to get feedback on this. Maybe we can make some quick changes, and agree on what / how things should go forward for Tuesday's meeting.

Tuesday Discussions:

As for the discussions on Tuesday, I think we should run through some of the examples (which don't have weights right now), and pull out some of the key issues that come out. I think Lisa has done this, and identified these as "shaded" in my tables. Some of the key issues are:

1. Lines of evidence relative to fish and PAH exposure. I added some more in here that we had discussed with Lisa, but maybe they have additional ideas. I know Burt had suggested toxicity testing. However, I believe a weighting exercise will show that there is a great deal of uncertainty relative to the exposure and effects side of the assessment. We suggested stomach contents to reduce that uncertainty.
2. A risk framework for transition zone water. I have added the possible line of evidence of toxicity testing. When tox testing is triggered (or if it is) should be discussed. It is an area we have not tackled with them yet.
3. Under exposure assessment, there is a disagreement regarding the *spatial representation* (data quality) of the data for some species. We have identified a few species where we think the spatial representation is inadequate for the assessment currently. These include sculpin, crayfish and

smallmouth bass. We may be closer to agreement on the sculpin and crayfish data needs, but the smallmouth bass will be an area of disagreement. This may primarily stem around a disagreement in likely exposure area.

4. We have identified additional fish tissue needs for larger ranging fish as well. The issue here is not a spatial representation question, but a *data quality* question (do we have enough samples - approx 6 or less for some - to assess risk and confidently populate the food web model).

5. I didn't touch the lamprey and sturgeon issues - I didn't have time. However, I think this is less of a matrix / framework issue and more of a need to move forward with data collection (in some cases) because we know we currently don't have adequate data to assess them (and the additional analysis of data will not help).

Thanks!

-Jennifer

<<PH_EcoFrameworkMatrix5_5_06.xls>>